1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
3	RICHMOND DIVISION
4	
5	
6 7	LULA WILLIAMS, et al., on behalf : of themselves and all individuals : Civil Action No. similarly situated : 3:17CV461
	vs.
8	BIG PICTURE LOANS, LLC, et al. : June 24, 2020
9	RENEE GALLOWAY, et al., as :
10	individuals and as representatives : Civil Action No. of the classes : 3:18CV406
11 12	vs. : BIG PICTURE LOANS, LLC, et al. :
131415	COMPLETE TRANSCRIPT OF THE CONFERENCE CALL
16	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT E. PAYNE
17	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
18	
19	APPEARANCES:
20	Leonard A. Bennett, Esquire
21	Consumer Litigation Associates, PC 763 J Clyde Morris Boulevard Suite 1A
22	Newport News, Virginia 23601
23	
24	Peppy Peterson, RPR
25	Official Court Reporter United States District Court

```
APPEARANCES: (cont'g)
 1
     Kristi C. Kelly, Esquire
 2
     Andrew J. Guzzo, Esquire
 3
     Kelly Guzzo, PLC
     3925 Chain Bridge Road
 4
     Suite 202
     Fairfax, Virginia 22030
 5
     Michael A. Caddell, Esquire
 6
     Caddell & Chapman
     628 East 9th Street
     Houston, Texas 77007
 7
     Counsel for the plaintiffs
 8
 9
10
     Michelle L. Alamo, Esquire
     Armstrong Teasdale, LLP
11
     4643 S Ulster Street
     Suite 800
     Denver, Colorado 80237
12
13
     John M. Erbach, Esquire
     Spotts Fain, PC
14
     411 East Franklin Street
     Suite 600
     Richmond, Virginia 23219
15
16
     Michael C. Witsch, Esquire
     Armstrong Teasdale LLP
17
     2005 Market Street - 29th Floor
     One Commerce Square
18
     Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
     Counsel for Matt Martorello
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

PROCEEDINGS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

1

THE COURT: Hello. This call is in Williams v. Big Picture Loans, 3:17CV461, Galloway v. Big Picture Loans, 3:18CV406. Is it in any other case?

MR. BENNETT: No, sir. This is Len Bennett.

THE COURT: That's what we've seen. We have had filed here three motions, the plaintiffs' motion to bar expert testimony, ECF 792 in Williams, ECF 440 in Galloway with a supporting memorandum, plaintiffs' motion to exclude testimony from witnesses not identified in discovery, Williams 794, Galloway 442, and plaintiffs' motion to exclude prior deposition testimony, Williams number 796, Galloway number 444.

We need to set a briefing schedule that needs to move right along, so have you all talked about dates in anticipation of the call? If not -- for Martorello's opposition, what is your position, and that's what we need to do. Before we do that, please give me who is on the call for whom and who you are representing.

MS. ALAMO: Your Honor, it's Michelle Alamo on behalf of Mr. Martorello. I wasn't sure you wanted all counsel's appearances or just ours.

THE COURT: I want everybody.

MR. ERBACH: Your Honor, this is John Erbach also for Matt Martorello.

20

21

22

23 24

25

MR. WITSCH: And, Your Honor, Michael Witsch for Matt 1 Martorello is also on the call. 2 3 THE COURT: For the plaintiffs? 4 MS. KELLY: Good afternoon, Judge. This is Kristi 5 Kelly for the plaintiff, and I believe Len Bennett was also on 6 the call, but I haven't heard him since. 7 MR. BENNETT: I'm on the phone, Judge. 8 THE COURT: Mr. Bennett. Anybody else? 9 MR. GUZZO: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is also Andrew Guzzo for the plaintiffs. 10 11 THE COURT: Is that everybody? 12 MR. CADDELL: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is 13 Mike Caddell for the plaintiff. 14 THE COURT: Mr. Caddell, who are you with again? MR. CADDELL: Caddell and Chapman in Houston, Your 15 16 Honor, and we filed a notice of appearance in the cases. 17 THE COURT: When did you do that? 18 MR. CADDELL: I believe about two weeks ago. 19 THE COURT: All right. And will you mind telling me 20 why you are coming in at this stage? 21 MR. CADDELL: Your Honor, we have companion cases in 22 Oregon and Massachusetts, and we've agreed to work 23 cooperatively, and I have been in front of the Court, your court, on other -- in other matters, and it was felt that I 24 could be of assistance. In fact, I took a deposition in this 25

case on Monday with respect to the misrepresentation hearing. 1 2 THE COURT: That's very interesting given the 3 arguments that are being made about the motions, number 796 in 4 Williams and 444 in Galloway. I'll be interested to see how 5 that all pans out. We need to set a schedule. When do you 6 want to file your response, Ms. Alamo? 7 MS. ALAMO: Your Honor, we could file by July 1st. 8 THE COURT: That's about a week from today; right? 9 MS. ALAMO: A week from today. 10 THE COURT: All right. And when are you going to 11 file your reply, Mr. Bennett? MR. BENNETT: July 8th, which would be a Wednesday. 12 13 THE COURT: That will be the date they'll be filed. MR. BENNETT: Your Honor. 14 15 THE COURT: Yes. MR. BENNETT: Just not to continue to pile on the 16 17 work here for all, but there are two other matters that we at 18 least want to bring to the Court's attention that might be the 19 subject of motions. One is contested and, apparently, one not. 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 MR. BENNETT: The first is, the uncontested one is 22 that the parties have agreed now, today, to a schedule for making discovery designations. You'll see from the respective 23 witness list that both sides rely heavily on depositions, but 24 25 we had neglected to put in our previous scheduling order an

accommodation for discovery deposition designations, and we'll submit that by agreed order formally on the docket, but just to give the Court a heads-up, the plaintiff will be serving our discovery designations this coming Monday, and the defendant will be serving those designations when it serves its response to our brief which is, I think, the 13th.

MS. ALAMO: Correct.

THE COURT: When are you going -- are these videotaped depositions?

MR. BENNETT: Some are, Judge, and --

THE COURT: Well, let's get straight what we're doing here. I don't consider any depositions for any purpose unless you have designated and have first worked out any objections that you have and present to me, in a cogent form, any objections on which I need to rule.

Objections on which I rule are to be presented in the following way: A transcript -- a copy of the transcript, not the entire transcript, just the part that's at issue, is prepared, and then you highlight who is offering -- let me know who is offering it, who is objecting to it, and in the margin tell me what the objection is so that I know what it is that I am dealing with, or if you don't object to anything, then you don't object to it, but I've never had that happen, so I'm not expecting it will happen now.

Ordinarily the plaintiff takes one color and the

defendants take the other, and you do your highlighting. That way I can identify readily what it is, and I just want what it is that I'm being called upon to rule on. I don't want the whole deposition.

I don't know if any of you have been through that process here before, but you can talk to lawyers who have and work it out. But if you don't do that, I'm not taking the depositions and ruling on them at trial.

And then you have to do them -- or at the hearing.

Then you have to do all that in time to edit -- for me to rule on it and edit the deposition, videotaped deposition, and the other depositions -- I mean, the printed deposition you don't need to worry about, but the video deposition you have to edit.

So that's part of what you have yet in front of you, and you didn't mention any of that in your discussion, Mr.

Bennett, which is why I went into that discussion. Do you understand what I'm saying?

MR. BENNETT: I do, Judge, and we've been through the process for trial in this court, and I'm sure that defense counsel is well represented locally and also has, and we'll make sure that we put that in the order and comply and provide for sufficient time for that process, Your Honor.

THE COURT: What's the contested matter that you are speaking of?

MR. BENNETT: As is customary, we've asked for

previous testimony, deposition transcripts of Mr. Martorello. We understand that he is being deposed, I believe tomorrow and the next day, by the tribe in its arbitration matter. We learned that about a week ago, reached out to defense counsel and reached out to the tribal defendants' counsel to confirm that we would be able to receive a copy of those transcripts of Matthew Martorello, of the deposition. Certainly we represented we would pay for any expedited transcripts.

We understand from the tribal defendants that they -they don't have an objection, they just don't want to offend
any protective order demands that Mr. Martorello makes, but we
understand that Mr. Martorello does not -- his lawyers have not
yet agreed to produce the transcript for those upcoming
depositions.

Our deposition of Mr. Martorello are scheduled next week. So we believe that having those transcripts would certainly shorten, expedite, and make more efficient our intended deposition as well.

THE COURT: Are you saying that Mr. Martorello's counsel has refused to provide them or they haven't responded to you?

MR. BENNETT: I understand --

MS. ALAMO: Your Honor, if I may, it's Michelle
Alamo, and I'm the one who responded to plaintiffs' counsel,
and I told him I could not agree at this point because the

depositions have not been taken. They're being taken in an arbitration that involves claims unrelated to this case. I do not know what issues will be presented there or if they have any relevance to this case, and I do not know at this point if any party is going to lodge confidentiality objections.

I have not heard from the tribal defendants in their arbitration that they've had any agreement reached with Mr.

Bennett. So, right now, I would say this is not ripe and that it's premature. The deposition is taking place today. One is Mr. Martorello in his personal capacity and one as ECA's manager, Eventide. Eventide is not a party to this action. So I don't know that it's contested yet.

THE COURT: Is your firm counsel to Mr. Martorello in that action?

MS. ALAMO: Mr. Martorello is being deposed in his personal capacity. He is not a party to that action. He's a fact witness in that action. He's being represented at his deposition by Loeb & Loeb. The arbitration does not involve claims against or brought by Mr. Martorello.

THE COURT: He's a witness.

MS. ALAMO: He's a witness.

THE COURT: I'm not being asked to rule on anything now, and so I'm not going to, but it seems to me like there's a big difference between whether what he says is admissible and whether counsel can have access to the depositions to decide

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that issue.

whether they want to offer it or not. It seems to me that there are two different issues. Mr. -- who is representing -what did you say, he's testifying as an officer of who? MS. ALAMO: Eventide Credit Acquisitions, I believe as their corporate designee --THE COURT: Who is representing Mr. Martorello in that deposition? MS. ALAMO: Loeb & Loeb. THE COURT: Loeb & Loeb is representing him in both depositions then, the personal and the 30(b)(6); is that right? MS. ALAMO: Yes. I believe so, yes. THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me like the people who have -- what jurisdiction do I have at this juncture to order anything about those depositions? You have to get access to them first, don't you, Mr. Bennett? MR. BENNETT: Well, yes, sir. We've asked for them in discovery in this case for Mr. Martorello, and so the issue -- the proffered position from the defendant is it's not ripe because they haven't yet reviewed them because -- we're just trying to keep things moving, and you can hear from the continued position-taking that the defendant is going to argue that it doesn't -- that Mr. Martorello is not the same thing as Eventide which is, of course, what happened in the bankruptcy when the Court down there dismissed for bad faith because of

THE COURT: What difference does it make? If a witness testifies, that testimony can be used as evidence in an appropriate situation or to impeach if the rules respecting whether or not they can be used for affirmative purposes and impeachment respectively are satisfied, but the question is whether the transcript is available it seems to me. Isn't that the issue you are raising?

MR. BENNETT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Then I think you all need to sort that out and figure out how to deal with that. I don't know what I can do about that, but it may be that I -- I guess you said you filed an interrogatory answer or a request for production, and Martorello's a defendant in this case, and so if he's an individual and if he's a 30(b)(6) witness, it would seem to me that there isn't any reason why he can't be required to answer that interrogatory, and if he refuses to provide it, then I guess the proper remedy is a motion to compel. I guess that's what I'd do. I don't know. I haven't figured it out and haven't given it any thought.

So it seems to me that what you need -- when did you posit the interrogatory or the request for production of documents respecting that, the transcript of these two depositions that he's giving today?

MR. BENNETT: Generally as to all of them, Judge, and so we were just trying to head off the conflict that we're

going to have. As the Court knows, the discovery obligation is 2 to produce documents over which Mr. Martorello has possession 3 or control, and he would have the ability to obtain that 4 transcript as soon as the deposition is completed. 5 THE COURT: Well, I'll let you deal with all that. You figure the law out, and if there's an issue, you can 6 7 present it to me. I'm not going to try to brainstorm it with 8 you all now. You can present the issue in the form of whatever 9 motion you want to present if you need to present. 10 As a general proposition, courts favor having the 11 parties have access to whatever a witness has said on a topic, and then whether or not that comes in is a different, entirely 12 13 different question because it's got to meet certain rules before it comes in. So we'll deal with that if and when you 14 15 figure that out. You figure it out and where you stand and what you need to do. Anything else that needs to be done? 16 17 MR. BENNETT: No, sir. 18 MS. ALAMO: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right, thank you very much. 19 20 MS. ALAMO: Thank you. 21 22 23 (End of proceedings.)

24

25

Ī	
1	
2	
3	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
4	from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
5	
6	
7	/s/ P. E. Peterson, RPR Date
8	T. H. Tecerson, KIK
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	